

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

GREEN PARTY OF TENNESSEE,)
CONSTITUTION PARTY OF)
TENNESSEE,)
Plaintiffs,)
v.)
Case No. 3:11-cv-00692
TRE HARGETT, in his official capacity as)
Tennessee Secretary of State, and MARK)
GOINS, in his official capacity as)
Coordinator of Elections for the State of)
Tennessee,)
Defendants.)

Judge Haynes

PLAINTIFFS' AGREED MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO
FILE REPLY BRIEF IN EXCESS OF TWENTY-FIVE PAGES

ON PSH
This motion
is GRANTED
by [Signature]
1-3-12

COME NOW Plaintiffs and request that this Court permit them to file their brief in support of their motion for summary judgment, which exceeds the twenty-five (25) page limit provided for in Local Rule 7.01. In support of this motion, Defendant would state as follows:

- 1) On December 12, 2011, Defendants filed their RESPONSE to Plaintiffs' motions for summary judgment. Defendants' RESPONSE was 64 pages lone and included Exhibits totaling in excess of 50 pages.
- 2) In addition to responding (in varying degrees) to the five Counts in Plaintiffs motions for summary judgment, Defendants raised new issues relating to (a) Plaintiffs rights to challenge the facial constitutionality of various provisions of the Tennessee Code and (b) Plaintiffs standing to assert specific claims as well as claims that certain on Plaintiffs claims are barred by estoppel. Each of these assertions requires a detailed response.
- 3) Defendants have also presented defenses based on provisions of the Tennessee Code that were not initially challenged by Plaintiffs but which Plaintiffs believe are unconstitutional. Each of these defenses requires a detailed response.
- 4) Given the multitude and variety of issues contained in Defendants RESPONSE, Plaintiffs' submit that it is necessary for them to exceed the twenty-five (25) page limit in order to adequately and fully respond to all of Defendants arguments.